

TAUP 2526-98
15 October, 1998

**Effect of Non-Orthogonality of Residues in the Wigner-Weisskopf model
on
Regeneration for the Neutral K Meson system**

Eli Cohen and L.P. Horwitz*

Department of Physics and Astronomy
Raymond and Beverly Sackler Faculty of Exact Sciences
Tel Aviv University, Ramat Aviv 69978, Israel

Abstract: We review the application of the Wigner-Weisskopf model to the two-channel decay problem for the neutral K meson system in the resolvent formalism. The residues in the pole approximation are not orthogonal, leading to additional interference terms in the $K_S - K_L$ 2π channel. We show that these terms lead to non-trivial changes in the exit beam in comparison to the result calculated with the assumptions of Lee, Oehme and Yang, and Wu and Yang, corresponding to semigroup evolution for which the pole residues are orthogonal, and hence appear to rule out the applicability of the Wigner-Weisskopf model for the computation of regeneration in the neutral K meson system.

* Also at Department of Physics, Bar Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Israel

In 1957 Lee, Oehme and Yang¹ constructed a generalization of the Wigner-Weisskopf² decay model in pole approximation, in terms of a two-by-two non-Hermitian effective Hamiltonian, leading to an exact semigroup law of evolution for the two channel K^0 decay. Wu and Yang³ developed, from this model, an effective parametrization of the $K^0 \rightarrow 2\pi$ decays, resulting in a phenomenology that has been very useful in describing the experimental results. Since the early 1970's, Monte Carlo reproduction of the data, establishing the parameter values, has been remarkably accurate in the energy 60-120 GeV of the kaon beam³.

We wish to point out that the Wigner-Weisskopf model² is not, in fact, consistent with such semigroup evolution in pole approximation, and that the difference between the Wigner-Weisskopf prediction and semigroup evolution could, in principle, be seen experimentally. The experimental data may therefore rule out the applicability of the Wigner-Weisskopf theory even on the level of the pole approximation. In this letter, we consider the structure of the two channel Wigner-Weisskopf model on the regeneration process. We treat elsewhere the $K_S - K_L$ 2π interference channel at the output of a regenerator⁴.

Regeneration systems are designed to reconstitute the K_S beam from a K_L beam in the order of $K_S : K_L \cong 10^{-3} : 1$, since the K_S beam decays rapidly with high branching ratio to 2π , while the K_L beam decays to 2π only on the order of 10^{-3} , the measure of CP violation.

The Wigner-Weisskopf model of particle decay (we first treat the one-channel case) assumes that there is an initial state in the Hilbert space representation of an unstable system; in the course of time, Hamiltonian action evolves this state, and the component that remains in the ϕ direction is called the survival amplitude:

$$A(t) = (\phi, e^{-iHt} \phi). \quad (1)$$

Defining the reduced resolvent, analytic for z in the upper half plane, in terms of the Laplace transform

$$\begin{aligned} R(z) &= -i \int_0^\infty \exp^{izt} (\phi, e^{-iHt} \phi) dt \\ &= (\phi, \frac{1}{z - H} \phi), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

we see that

$$(\phi, e^{-iHt} \phi) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_C dz e^{-izt} (\phi, \frac{1}{z - H} \phi), \quad (3)$$

where C is a contour running from ∞ to 0 slightly above the real axis, and from 0 to ∞ slightly below. The lower contour can be deformed to the negative imaginary axis, providing a contribution which is small except near the branch point, and the upper contour can be deformed downward (with suitable conditions on the spectral function) into the second Riemann sheet, where a resonance pole may appear. Assuming that the resonance contribution is large compared to the "background" integrals, the reduced motion of the survival amplitude is well-approximated by

$$(\phi, e^{-iHt} \phi) \cong g e^{-iz_0 t}, \quad (4)$$

where g is the t -independent part of the residue ($\approx$ unity), and

$$z_0 = E_0 - i\frac{\Gamma_0}{2}$$

is the pole position. It appears that this evolution could be generalized for the two channel case by replacing z_0 by an effective 2×2 non-Hermitian Hamiltonian. As we shall see, this structure is not generally admitted by the Wigner-Weisskopf model.

For the two-channel system, consider a state ϕ_i , $i = 1, 2$; let us calculate the decay amplitude $\phi_i \rightarrow |\lambda_j\rangle$, $j = 1, 2$, the continuum accessible by means of the dynamical evolution e^{-iHt} :

$$\sum_j \int d\lambda |\langle \lambda_j | e^{-iHt} | \phi_i \rangle|^2 = 1 - \sum_j |(\phi_j, e^{-iHt} \phi_i)|^2. \quad (6)$$

Here, the survival amplitude corresponds to the 2×2 matrix

$$A_{ij}(t) = (\phi_i, e^{-iHt} \phi_j).$$

This amplitude can be approximated in the same way as in (4) by estimating

$$(\phi_i, e^{-iHt} \phi_j) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_C dz (\phi_i, \frac{1}{z - H} \phi_j). \quad (7)$$

It is convenient to write the 2×2 matrix reduced resolvent in the form

$$R_{ij}(z) = (\phi_i, \frac{1}{z - H} \phi_j) = \left(\frac{1}{z - W(z)} \right)_{ij}, \quad (8)$$

where $W(z)$ is a 2×2 matrix. It is almost always true (an exception is the matrix with unity in upper right element, and all others zero) that $W(z)$ has the spectral decomposition

$$W(z) = g_1(z)w_1(z) + g_2(z)w_2(z), \quad (9)$$

where $w_1(z)$ and $w_2(z)$ are numerical valued, and $g_1(z), g_2(z)$ are 2×2 matrices with the property that

$$g_1(z)g_2(z) = 0, \quad (10)$$

and

$$g_1^2(z) = g_1(z), \quad g_2^2(z) = g_2(z), \quad (11)$$

even though $W(z)$ is not Hermitian. These matrices are constructed from the direct product of right and left eigenvectors of $W(z)$, and form a complete set

$$g_1(z) + g_2(z) = 1. \quad (12)$$

Suppose now that the short lived K -decay channel has a pole at z_S . The matrix $W(z_S)$ (in the second Riemann sheet) can be represented as

$$W(z_S) = z_S g_S(z_S) + z'_S g'_S(z_S), \quad (12)$$

where $g_S g'_S = 0$, and the corresponding eigenvalues are denoted by z_S, z'_S . Then the reduced resolvent, in the neighborhood of $z \cong z_S$ has the form

$$R_{ij}(z) \cong \frac{1}{(z - z_S)(1 + w'_1(z_S))} g_S(z_S) + \frac{1}{(z - z'_S)(1 + w'_2(z_S))} g'_S(z_S), \quad (13)$$

where $w'_1(z), w'_2(z)$ are the derivatives of the eigenvalues of $W(z)$, of order the square of the weak coupling constant (these functions correspond to the mass shifts induced by the weak interaction). The residues are therefore $g_S(z_S)$ and $g'_S(z_S)$ to a good approximation. For the long-lived component, on the other hand, the pole occurs at z_L , and at this point,

$$W(z_L) = z_L g_L(z_L) + z'_L g'_L(z_L). \quad (14)$$

The reduced resolvent in this neighborhood is then

$$R_{ij}(z) \cong \frac{1}{(z - z_L)(1 + w'_1(z_L))} g_L(z_L) + \frac{1}{(z - z'_L)(1 + w'_2(z_L))} g'_L(z_L). \quad (15)$$

Since $W(z_S)$ and $W(z_L)$ correspond to the matrix-valued function $W(z)$ evaluated at two different points, although $g_S(z_S)$ and $g'_S(z_S)$ are orthogonal ($g_S(z_S)g'_S(z_S) = 0$), in general, $g_S(z_S)$ and $g_L(z_L)$ are not. If there were no CP violation, the matrix would be diagonal in the K_1, K_2 basis, and the two distinct idempotents would be structurally orthogonal even though they correspond to the decomposition of the matrix at two different points. One can estimate the product^{4,5}

$$\text{upper left element } g_S g_L = O(\alpha^3) = O(10^{-4}), \quad (16)$$

in a Lee-Friedrichs type model⁶, where α is the relative amplitude CP violation (independently of the strength of the weak interaction); the other matrix elements are of order α^4 or α^5 . The regeneration problem was treated previously⁵ with emphasis on the question of obtaining the maximal possible correction to the semigroup decay law^{1,2}. We re-examine this problem in the following to establish a lower bound for such corrections, and find that the Wigner-Weisskopf predictions are indeed incompatible with the experimental results.

We now study the composition of the beam in a regenerator. The usual method for the computation of regeneration is not applicable if the $U(t)$ do not form a semi-group. It is generally induced by placing a slab of material, such as copper, in the K meson beam.

At each scattering in the regenerator, the K_0 and $\bar{K}_0$ parts of the K_S and K_L are altered selectively by the amplitudes $f, \bar{f}$, the scattering amplitudes for $K_0, \bar{K}_0$ on the nuclear target.* After scattering, the new linear combination propagates freely according to $U'(t)$.

* G.Charpak and M.Gourdin:CERN 67-18. Our f corresponds to $2\pi i \frac{N}{m} \Delta t f^{K^0}$, where f^{K^0} is the amplitude used in this reference, and $\Delta t = \frac{m}{k} \Delta z$ is the time step of our iterative process (Δz is the mean lattice spacing of the material).

In terms of K_0 and $\overline{K}_0$, the effect of a single scattering is,

$$S|K_0\rangle = (1 + f)|K_0\rangle \quad (17)$$

$$S|\overline{K}_0\rangle = (1 + \overline{f})|\overline{K}_0\rangle \quad (18)$$

where S is the following term:

$$S = (1 + f)|K_0\rangle\langle K_0| + (1 + \overline{f})|\overline{K}_0\rangle\langle \overline{K}_0| \quad (19)$$

$U(\Delta t)$ is defined, in pole approximation, in the following way:

$$U(\Delta t) \cong e^{-iz_S \Delta t} g_S + e^{-iz_L \Delta t} g_L \quad (20)$$

where g_S, g_L are the approximate residues of the reduced resolvent, $R'(z)$, on the second sheet. We represent these idempotents by

$$g_S = |K_S\rangle\langle \tilde{K}_S|$$

$$g_L = |K_L\rangle\langle \tilde{K}_L|$$

where $|K_S\rangle, |\tilde{K}_S\rangle$ are the left and right eigenvectors of the reduced evolution matrix (9) at z_S for the eigenvalue z_S and $|K_L\rangle, |\tilde{K}_L\rangle$ at z_L for the eigenvalue z_L . Let us assume that the beam has initially the following form:

$$|\psi\rangle = \alpha|K_0\rangle + \beta|\overline{K}_0\rangle \quad (21)$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} U(\Delta t)S|\psi\rangle &= U(\Delta t)S(\alpha|K_0\rangle + \beta|\overline{K}_0\rangle) = \\ &= \alpha(1 + f)(e^{-iz_S \Delta t} g_S + e^{-iz_L \Delta t} g_L)|K_0\rangle + \beta(1 + \overline{f})(e^{-iz_S \Delta t} g_S + e^{-iz_L \Delta t} g_L)|\overline{K}_0\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

The following terms appear in this equation:

$$\begin{aligned} g_S|K_0\rangle &= |K_S\rangle\langle \tilde{K}_S|K_0\rangle = \frac{1 + \tilde{\epsilon}_S}{\sqrt{2(1 + |\tilde{\epsilon}_S|^2)}}|K_S\rangle \\ g_S|\overline{K}_0\rangle &= |K_S\rangle\langle \tilde{K}_S|\overline{K}_0\rangle = \frac{1 - \tilde{\epsilon}_S}{\sqrt{2(1 + |\tilde{\epsilon}_S|^2)}}|K_S\rangle \\ g_L|K_0\rangle &= |K_L\rangle\langle \tilde{K}_L|K_0\rangle = \frac{1 + \tilde{\epsilon}_L}{\sqrt{2(1 + |\tilde{\epsilon}_L|^2)}}|K_L\rangle \\ g_L|\overline{K}_0\rangle &= |K_L\rangle\langle \tilde{K}_L|\overline{K}_0\rangle = \frac{\tilde{\epsilon}_L - 1}{\sqrt{2(1 + |\tilde{\epsilon}_L|^2)}}|K_L\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Neglecting terms second order in ϵ , f and changing the basis to $|K_1\rangle, |K_2\rangle$ we get that the matrix elements of

$$U(\Delta t)S = A \quad (24)$$

are

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{11} &= (1 + f_+)e^{-iz_S \Delta t} \\
A_{12} &= (\tilde{\epsilon}_S + f_-)e^{-iz_S \Delta t} + \epsilon_L e^{-iz_L \Delta t} \\
A_{21} &= \epsilon_S e^{-iz_S \Delta t} + (\tilde{\epsilon}_L + f_-)e^{-iz_L \Delta t} \\
A_{22} &= (1 + f_+)e^{-iz_L \Delta t}
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
f_+ &= \frac{f + \bar{f}}{2} \\
f_- &= \frac{f - \bar{f}}{2}
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
|K_1\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|K_0\rangle + |\bar{K}_0\rangle) \\
|K_2\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|K_0\rangle - |\bar{K}_0\rangle)
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

The states $|K_1\rangle$ and $|K_2\rangle$ are orthonormal:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle K_1|K_1\rangle &= \langle K_2|K_2\rangle = 1 \\
\langle K_1|K_2\rangle &= 0
\end{aligned}$$

We define $\epsilon_S, \tilde{\epsilon}_S, \epsilon_L, \tilde{\epsilon}_L$ by⁵:

$$\begin{aligned}
|K_S\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + |\epsilon_S|^2}}(|K_1\rangle + \epsilon_S|K_2\rangle) \\
|K_L\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + |\epsilon_L|^2}}(\epsilon_L|K_1\rangle + |K_2\rangle) \\
\langle \tilde{K}_S| &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + |\tilde{\epsilon}_S|^2}}(\langle K_1| + \tilde{\epsilon}_S\langle K_2|) \\
\langle \tilde{K}_L| &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + |\tilde{\epsilon}_L|^2}}(\tilde{\epsilon}_L\langle K_1| + \langle K_2|)
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

and,

$$\begin{aligned}
f &= e^{i\delta_0} - 1 \\
\bar{f} &= e^{i\bar{\delta}_0} - 1
\end{aligned}$$

By multiplying the matrix $[U(\Delta t)S]$ n times and keeping only first order in $f, \bar{f}$, and ϵ , we get the following matrix elements for $[U(\Delta t)S]^n = A(n)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
A(n)_{11} &= (1 + nf_+)e^{-inz_S \Delta t} \\
A(n)_{12} &= (\tilde{\epsilon}_S + f_-)e^{-inz_S \Delta t} \\
&\quad + \epsilon_L e^{-inz_L \Delta t} + (\tilde{\epsilon}_S + \epsilon_L + f_-) \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} e^{-i[kz_S + (n-k)z_L]\Delta t} \\
A(n)_{21} &= \epsilon_S e^{-inz_S \Delta t} + (\tilde{\epsilon}_L + f_-)e^{-inz_L \Delta t} \\
&\quad + (\epsilon_S + \tilde{\epsilon}_L + f_-) \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} e^{-i[kz_S + (n-k)z_L]\Delta t} \\
A(n)_{22} &= (1 + nf_+)e^{-inz_L \Delta t}
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

The product of the residues (16) is

$$\begin{aligned} g_S g_L &= |K_S\rangle \langle \tilde{K}_L | (\epsilon_L + \tilde{\epsilon}_S) \\ g_L g_S &= |K_L\rangle \langle \tilde{K}_S | (\epsilon_L + \tilde{\epsilon}_L) \end{aligned}$$

and here, if these vanish,

$$\epsilon_L + \tilde{\epsilon}_S = \epsilon_S + \tilde{\epsilon}_L = 0.$$

We obtain for this case,

$$\begin{aligned} A(n)_{12}^0 &= (-\epsilon_L + f_-) e^{-inz_S \Delta t} - \tilde{\epsilon}_S e^{-inz_L \Delta t} + f_- \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} e^{-i[kz_S + (n-k)z_L] \Delta t} \\ A(n)_{21}^0 &= -\tilde{\epsilon}_L e^{-inz_S \Delta t} + (-\epsilon_S + f_-) e^{-inz_L \Delta t} + f_- \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} e^{-i[kz_S + (n-k)z_L] \Delta t}. \end{aligned}$$

We can then subtract the two cases, i.e., consider $A(n) - A(n)^0$, and the sums can be carried out. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta A(n)_{12} &= (\epsilon_L + \tilde{\epsilon}_S) (e^{-inz_L \Delta t} + \frac{(e^{-i(n+2)(z_S - z_L) \Delta t} - e^{-i(z_S - z_L) \Delta t}) e^{-inz_L \Delta t}}{e^{-i(z_S - z_L) \Delta t} - 1}) \\ \Delta A(n)_{21} &= (\epsilon_S + \tilde{\epsilon}_L) (e^{-inz_L \Delta t} + \frac{(e^{-i(n+2)(z_S - z_L) \Delta t} - e^{-i(z_S - z_L) \Delta t}) e^{-inz_L \Delta t}}{e^{-i(z_S - z_L) \Delta t} - 1}) \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where $A(n)_{12}^0$ and $A(n)_{21}^0$ are the matrices corresponding to the orthogonal case. For n large compared to unity and we find (the n -dependent exponential factor cancels in the ratio), for example,

$$\frac{\Delta A(n)_{12}}{A(n)_{12}} \cong \frac{\epsilon_L + \tilde{\epsilon}_S}{(\tilde{\epsilon}_S + f_-) e^{-i(z_S - z_L) \Delta t} + \epsilon_L}.$$

The numerator is of order 10^{-4} . Since $(z_S - z_L) \Delta t \ll 1$, the denominator is approximately $\epsilon_L + \tilde{\epsilon}_S + f_-$. At $1 \text{ GeV}/c$, f_- is of order⁵ 10^{-11} , and at higher energies it is smaller (falling approximately as k^{-1}); hence $\frac{\Delta A(n)_{12}}{A(n)_{12}}$ could be of order unity. The validity of the the results of Monte Carlo estimates for regeneration according to the parametrization of ref. 2 would then appear to rule out the applicability of the Wigner-Weisskopf model for the computation of regeneration.

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank I. Dunietz, C. Newton, B. Winstein, and T.T. Wu for helpful discussions.

References

1. T.D. Lee, R. Oehme and C.N. Yang, Phys. Rev. **106**, 340 (1957).
2. T.T. Wu and C.N. Yang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **13**, 380 (1964).
3. B. Winstein, *et al*, *Results from the Neutral Kaon Program at Fermilab's Meson Center Beamline, 1985-1997*, FERMILAB-Pub-97/087-E, published on behalf of the E731, E773 and E799 Collaborations, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, P.O. Box 500, Batavia, Illinois 60510.
4. E. Cohen and L.P. Horwitz, submitted for publication.
5. L.P. Horwitz and L. Mizrahi, Nuovo Cim. **21A**, 625 (1974).
6. K.O. Friedrichs, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **1**, 361 (1948); T.D. Lee, Phys. Rev. **95**, 1329 (1956).